REMARKS

This application has been carefully reviewed in light of the Office Action dated April 8, 2008. Claims 1 to 20 are pending in the application, of which Claims 1, 8, 10, 17, 19 and 20 are independent. Reconsideration and further examination are respectfully requested.

Claims 1 to 20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph regarding the term "can enter". Without conceding the correctness of the rejection, the terminology has been more positively recited. Thus, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection are respectfully requested.

Claims 1, 8, 10, 17, 19 and 20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) over U.S. Patent No. 5,684,957 (Kondo), Claims 2, 4, 5, 7, 11, 13, 14 and 16 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Kondo in view of U.S. Patent No. 7,216,292 (Snapper), and Claims 3, 6, 9, 12, 15 and 18 were rejected under § 103(a) over Kondo in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,666,502 (Capps). Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections are respectfully requested.

The present invention relates to holding, or not holding, login history of a plurality of users based on the type of user. According to one aspect of the invention, user identification information for a plurality of users is stored in a storage unit, where the user identification information includes a first type of user (e.g., a default user) and a second type of user (e.g., a non-default user). Information can be set whether or not to hold login history for each user, where the login history is used for entering user identification information in an entry screen. That is, for users in which the login history has been set to be held, when the entry screen is displayed, those users are displayed on the entry screen

so that the user wanting to login can merely select their name from the list. In addition, when the user enters their user identification information (and optionally, a password), depending on the type of user corresponding to the entered user identification information, the history information is either automatically held without requesting that the user set the information whether to hold the history information (e.g., automatically set to be held for default users), or the entry screen is displayed so as to allow the second type of user (e.g., non-default users) to set the information to hold the history.

Referring specifically to the claims, Claim 1 is directed to a device for performing a login process by using user identification information of a user input in an entry screen, comprising a storage unit configured to store user identification information of each of a plurality of users including a first type of user and a second type of user, a setting unit configured to set information whether to hold a login history for each user of the plurality of users, the login history being used for entering the user identification information in the entry screen, a holding unit configured to hold the login history for each user in accordance with the information set by the setting unit, a displaying unit configured to display the user identification information of users in which the information to hold the login history has been set based on the login history held in the holding unit, an entering unit configured to enter the user identification information of a user, and a controlling unit configured to cause the holding unit to hold the login history of the user corresponding to the entered user identification information without requesting the user to set the information whether to hold the login history in a case where the entered user identification information corresponds to the first type of user, and to control to allow the user to set the information whether to hold the login history in a case where the entered

user identification information corresponds to the second type of user, wherein the entering unit enters the user identification information in a case where any of the user identification information displayed on the displaying unit is selected.

Claims 10 and 19 are method and computer medium claims, respectively, that substantially correspond to Claim 1.

Claim 8 is along the lines of Claim 1, but is more specifically directed to a data processing device displaying an entry screen for entering user identification information and password information, comprising a storage unit configured to store user identification information and password information for each of a plurality of users, the user identification information and the password information being associated with each other, a setting unit configured to set information whether to hold the user identification information which is to be used for entering the user identification information in the entry screen, a display controlling unit configured to allow a display unit to display the user identification information that is set to be held by the setting unit on the entry screen, an entering unit configured to enter the user identification information and the password information on the entry screen, and a controlling unit configured to cause a holding unit to hold login history of the user corresponding to the entered user identification information without requesting the user to set information whether to hold the login history in a case where the entered user identification information corresponds to a first type of user, and controls to allow the user to set the information whether to hold the login history in a case where the entered user identification information corresponds to a second type of user, wherein the entering unit enters the user identification information in a case where the user

identification information displayed on the entry screen by the display controlling unit is selected.

Claims 17 and 20 are method and computer medium claims, respectively, that substantially correspond to Claim 8.

The applied art, alone or in any permissible combination, is not seen to disclose or to suggest the features of Claims 1, 10 and 19, and in particular, is not seen to disclose or to suggest at least the features of setting information whether to hold a login history for each user of a plurality of users, the login history being used for entering the user identification information in the entry screen, and causing a holding unit to hold the login history of a user corresponding to entered user identification information without requesting the user to set the information whether to hold the login history in a case where the entered user identification information corresponds to a first type of user, and allowing the user to set the information whether to hold the login history in a case where the entered user identification information corresponds to a second type of user. Similarly, with regard to Claims 8, 17 and 20, the applied art is not seen to disclose or to suggest at least the features of setting information whether to hold user identification information which is to be used for entering user identification information in an entry screen, and causing a holding unit to hold login history of a user corresponding to entered user identification information without requesting the user to set information whether to hold the login history in a case where the entered user identification information corresponds to a first type of user, and allowing the user to set the information whether to hold the login history in a case where the entered user identification information corresponds to a second type of user.

Kondo is seen to teach a network management system which records privileged user's accesses to a network device and general user's accesses to a network device. Also, the network management system investigates a login record table of a designated computer and displays on an output device the login time band at which the privileged user has executed the login procedure and the logout time band at which the privileged user has performed a logout procedure. However, Kondo is not seen to teach the features of setting information whether to hold a login history for each user of a plurality of users, the login history being used for entering the user identification information in the entry screen, and causing a holding unit to hold the login history of a user corresponding to entered user identification information without requesting the user to set the information whether to hold the login history in a case where the entered user identification information corresponds to a first type of user, and allowing the user to set the information whether to hold the login history in a case where the entered user identification information corresponds to a second type of user (Claims 1, 10 and 19), or at least the features of setting information whether to hold user identification information which is to be used for entering user identification information in an entry screen, and causing a holding unit to hold login history of a user corresponding to entered user identification information without requesting the user to set information whether to hold the login history in a case where the entered user identification information corresponds to a first type of user, and allowing the user to set the information whether to hold the login history in a case where the entered user identification information corresponds to a second type of user (Claims 8, 17 and 20).

Snapper is seen to teach that an internet browser suggests values that a user has previously entered when the user enters a value in a user name field. However, Snapper is not seen to teach anything that, when combined with Kondo, would have resulted in the features of setting information whether to hold a login history for each user of a plurality of users, the login history being used for entering the user identification information in the entry screen, and causing a holding unit to hold the login history of a user corresponding to entered user identification information without requesting the user to set the information whether to hold the login history in a case where the entered user identification information corresponds to a first type of user, and allowing the user to set the information whether to hold the login history in a case where the entered user identification information corresponds to a second type of user (Claims 1, 10 and 19), or at least the features of setting information whether to hold user identification information which is to be used for entering user identification information in an entry screen, and causing a holding unit to hold login history of a user corresponding to entered user identification information without requesting the user to set information whether to hold the login history in a case where the entered user identification information corresponds to a first type of user, and allowing the user to set the information whether to hold the login history in a case where the entered user identification information corresponds to a second type of user (Claims 8, 17 and 20).

Capps is merely seen to teach setting a number (for example, five (5) names) for limiting the number of names that can be displayed on a history list. However, Capps is not seen to teach anything that, when combined with Kondo and/or Snapper, would have resulted in at least the features of setting information whether to hold a login

history for each user of a plurality of users, the login history being used for entering the user identification information in the entry screen, and causing a holding unit to hold the login history of a user corresponding to entered user identification information without requesting the user to set the information whether to hold the login history in a case where the entered user identification information corresponds to a first type of user, and allowing the user to set the information whether to hold the login history in a case where the entered user identification information corresponds to a second type of user (Claims 1, 10 and 19), or at least the features of setting information whether to hold user identification information which is to be used for entering user identification information in an entry screen, and causing a holding unit to hold login history of a user corresponding to entered user identification information without requesting the user to set information whether to hold the login history in a case where the entered user identification information corresponds to a first type of user, and allowing the user to set the information whether to hold the login history in a case where the entered user identification information corresponds to a second type of user (Claims 8, 17 and 20).

Accordingly, Claims 1, 10 and 19 are not believed to be anticipated by Kondo, nor would they have been obvious over any permissible combination of Kondo, Snapper and/or Capps.

No other matters having been raised, the entire application is believed to be in condition for allowance and such action is respectfully requested at the Examiner's earliest convenience.

Applicants' undersigned attorney may be reached in our Costa Mesa, California office at (714) 540-8700. All correspondence should continue to be directed to our below-listed address.

Respectfully submitted,

/Edward Kmett/

Edward A. Kmett
Attorney for Applicants
Registration No.: 42,746

FITZPATRICK, CELLA, HARPER & SCINTO
30 Rockefeller Plaza
New York, New York 10112-3800
Facsimile: (212) 218-2200

FCHS_WS 2302762v1